

EXTRAORDINARY PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

No. 1692 CUTTACK, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 2013/BHADRA 11, 1935

LABOUR & E. S. I. DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

The 17th August 2013

No. 10509—IR-(ID)-74/2012-LESI.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Award, dated the 19th June 2013 in Industrial Dispute Case No. 23 of 2013 of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Sambalpur to whom the industrial dispute between the Management of M/s East India Steels (P) Ltd., Industrial Area, Rourkela and its Workman Shri Hanu Khadia, ex Helper, represented through Sundargarh Mazdoor Sangha, Rourkela was referred to for adjudication is hereby published as in the Schedule below:—

SCHEDULE

IN THE COURT OF THE PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, SAMBALPUR
INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE CASE No. 23 of 2013
Dated the 19th June 2013

Present:

Shri Srikanta Mishra, LL.M., Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Sambalpur.

Between:

The Management of M/s East India Steels (P) Ltd., Industrial Area, Rourkela, Dist. Sundargarh-769004.

And

Its Workman Shri Hanu Khadia, ex Helper, represented through Sundargarh Mazdoor Sangha, Rourkela, HIG/B, 113, Phase-III, Stage-B, Kalinga Vihar, Chhend, Rourkela.

First Party—Management

Second Party—Workman

Appearances:

| For the First Party—Management | None |
|--------------------------------|------|
| For the Second Party—Workman | None |

AWARD

This award arises out of a reference made by the Government of Odisha, Labour & E.S.I Department under the power conferred by sub-section (5) of Sction 12, read with Clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) (for short the "Act") vide Order under Memo. No. 3706 (5), dated the 15th April 2013. The dispute involved under the Schedule of reference is as follows:—

"Whether the termination of the services of Shri Hanu Khadia, Helper with effect from the 7th August 2008 by the management of M/s East India Steels Pvt. Ltd., Industrial Area, Rourkela is legal and/or justified? If not, what relief Shri Khadia is entitled to?"

- 2. The second party named above filed a complaint before the Assistant Labour Commissioner, Rourkela-*cum*-Conciliation Officer, under the I.D. Act, on behalf of one Hanu Khadia, alleging that the said person worked as a Helper under the management but was illegally terminated from service with effect from the 7th August 2008. The Conciliation Officer could not settle the dispute as the management denied the aforesaid person as its workman. On the basis of the failure report submitted by the A.L.C., the reference was made by the Government.
- 3. The Union though, was directed to file claim statement within 15 days of receipt of the order of reference it did not comply the same. Besides the notice sent to the Union from this Court by Regd. Post, returned unserved with the remark of the Postal Authorities that the "Addresses is not known".

In view of the non-appearance of the second party and non-filing of claim statement, I am inclined to pass a No Dispute Award on the reference.

Dictated and corrected by me.

SRIKANTA MISHRA
19-6-2013
Presiding Officer
Labour Court, Sambalpur

SRIKANTA MISHRA
19-6-2013
Presiding Officer
Labour Court, Sambalpur

By order of the Governor

J. DALANAYAK

Under-Secretary to Government